



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,099	12/29/2005	Antonie Selis van de Bovenkamp	2409-0154PUS1	8519
2292 7590 12/02/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER BANH, DAVID H				
ART UNIT 2854		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/02/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,099

Applicant(s)VAN DE BOVENKAMP, ANTONIE
SELIS**Examiner**

DAVID BANH

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927) with respect to Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709).

Endo teaches a printing module (see Figures 3 and 4) comprising an impression roller **2**, a plate cylinder **1** and an anilox roller **33**, the plate cylinder **1** in use abuts against the impression roller **2** in use, and the anilox roller **33** being arranged in between the plate cylinder **1** and a doctor roller **34** such that a desired amount of ink is removed from the anilox roller **33** by the doctor roller **34**. Inherently, the members of the printing module will be mounted on a frame **38** to maintain their positions and will be rotatable to function as printing cylinders. Endo does not teach the relative position change of the cylinders relative to one another. However, Guaraldi teaches a cylinder arrangement with lift mechanisms for throwing cylinders off one another. In Guaraldi, cylinders function as the anilox roller **19**, plate cylinder **20** and impression cylinder **30** are taught. Guaraldi teaches that the anilox roller **19** can be independently thrown off without positioning

change of the other two cylinders (column 6, lines 40-47). Guaraldi also teaches that both anilox **19** and plate cylinders **20** can be thrown off together without a relative positioning change to one another but with the plate cylinder **20** changing in position relative to the impression roller **30** (column 7, lines 15-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a throwing off mechanism for moving some cylinders relative to others while maintaining the relative positioning of other cylinders for the purpose of adding or changing printing sleeves or inspecting the cylinders.

Finally, Well et al. teaches that doctor rollers and doctor blades are interchangeable (column 1, lines 13-23), so it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the doctor blade **34** in Endo with a doctor roller for the purpose of being able to construct the apparatus using readily available parts.

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709), as applied to claim 1, above in further view of Schaum (US Patent 5,662,038).

Claim 2: The combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. teaches all of the elements recited in parent claim 1. The combination does not does not teach that the plate cylinder assembly is provided with a stop surface, the second subframe being provided with a stop which abuts against the stop surface of the plate cylinder. However, Schaum teaches a stop surface (column 15, claim 9, lines 20-30), it teaches the second subframe is provided with a stop (column 15, claim 9, line 20-22) and Schaum teaches that the stop abuts against the stop surface of the print cylinder (column 15, claim 9, lines 20-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Endo,

Guaraldi and Wells et al. by adding the stop and stop surface as taught by Schaum for the purpose of being able to slow the print cylinder in necessary and emergency situations.

Claim 3: Schaum further teaches that the stopper member (column 15, lines 20-22, “adjustable stop”) is positionally adjustable.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485), Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709) and Schaum (US Patent 5,662,038), as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Anderson (US Patent 3,453,955).

Claim 4: The combination of Endo, Guaraldi, Wells et al. and Schaum teaches all of the limitations of claim 4 as found in the parent claim 2. The combination does not teach that the position of the stop surface may be adjustable relative to the plate cylinder. However, Anderson teaches that a stop surface on a plate cylinder that is positionally adjustable (column 7, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Endo, Guaraldi, Wells et al. and Schaum to incorporate the adjustability of the stop position as taught by Anderson for the purpose of being able to more easily stop the cylinder.

6. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Weishew (US Patent 6,412,409).

For claim 5: The combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 5 as found in parent claim 1 above. The combination does not teach the movable connects to the frames and subframes as claims. However, Weishew teaches that the

movable connection between the second subframe and the main frame is realized via a movable connection between the second subframe and the first subframe. Weishew teaches that the first subframe 26 (Figure 2) is secured by a clamping device including a pivoting lever to the second subframe 24a (column 3, lines 28-35, Figure 2, subframe of the mainframe). The first subframe is further displaceable (column 3, lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the frame composition of Weishew into the combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. for the purpose of facilitating moving of the cylinders.

For claim 6: Weishew teaches that the movable connection between the first subframe and the mainframe is a connection pivotable around a first pivot 42, 44 (column 3, lines 27-33, Figure 3).

For claim 7: Weishew teaches that the movable connection between the first subframe and the second subframe is a connection pivotable around a pivot 42, 44 (column 3, lines 27-33, Figure 3).

For claim 8: Weishew teaches that the movable connection between the second subframe and the mainframe is a pivotable connection around a pivot 52, 54 (column 3, lines 55-56, Figure 3).

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Guaraldi '609 (US Patent 5,301,609) and Lubke (US Patent 5,109,768).

The combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 9 as found in the parent claim 1. The combination does not does not teach a piston cylinder assembly which has a first end connected with the main frame and a second end connected to the first movable subframe such that with the aid of the piston cylinder assembly, the pressure which the plate cylinder exerts in use on the impression roller is settable. However, Guaraldi '609 teaches that a piston and cylinder assembly **140, 142** (see abstract, lines 18-22, Figure 2) that acts between the main frame **22** (see abstract, lines 1-2, Figure 1), which is connected to the main frame on a first end **50** (see abstract, lines 3-4, Figure 2) and a connected to a movable sub-frame on a second end **54** (see abstract, lines 6-9, Figure 2). Lubke teaches that the piston cylinder can aid in setting the pressure which the plate cylinder exerts on the impression roller (column 3, lines 17-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing module in the combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. by adding the piston taught by Guaraldi '609 so that the piston aids in setting the pressure on the plate cylinder and impression rollers as taught by Lubke for the purpose of being able to drive a web of printing material through the printing module.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Guaraldi '609 (US Patent 5,301,609).

The combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 10 as found in the parent claim 1. The combination does not teach that a second piston cylinder assembly which has a first end connected with the main frame and a second end connected with or abutting against the second subframe, such that with the aid of the piston-cylinder assembly,

the second subframe is adjustable relative to the main frame. However, Guaraldi '609 teaches that a piston and cylinder assembly (see abstract, lines 18-22, Figure 2, labels 140 and 142) that acts between the main frame (see abstract, lines 1-2, Figure 1, label 22, "frame"), which is connected to the main frame on a first end (see abstract, lines 3-4, Figure 2, label 50, "first bracket") and is connected to a movable sub-frame on a second end (see abstract, lines 6-9, Figure 2, label 54, "second bracket"). The piston and cylinder assembly additionally aids the subframe in being movable relative to the mainframe (column 12, lines 36-38 of claim 16, Figure 2, labels 140 and 142). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Wells et al. by adding the piston taught by Guaraldi '609 for the purpose of moving the frame and subframes.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485), Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709) and Schaum (US Patent 5,662,038) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Guaraldi '609 (US Patent 5,301,609).

The combination of Endo, Guaraldi, Well et al. and Schaum teaches all of the limitations of claim 11 as found in the parent claim 2. Endo does not teach that a second piston cylinder assembly which has a first end connected with the first subframe and a second end connected with or abutting against the second subframe, such that with the aid of the piston-cylinder assembly, the second subframe is adjustable relative to the main frame. However, Guaraldi '609 teaches that a piston and cylinder assembly **140, 142** (see abstract, lines 18-22, Figure 2,) that acts between the main frame **22** (see abstract, lines 1-2, Figure 1), which is connected to the first subframe on a first end **50** (see abstract, lines 3-4, Figure 2, label 50) and is connected to a

movable sub-frame on a second end **54** (see abstract, lines 6-9, Figure 2). The piston and cylinder assembly **140**, **142** additionally aids the subframe **50** in being movable relative to the subframe **54** (column 12, lines 36-38 of claim 16, Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the printing module taught by Endo, Guaraldi, Wells et al. and Schaum by adding a piston taught by Guaraldi '609 for the purpose moving the subframes.

10. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US Patent 6,928,927), Guaraldi (US Patent 5,678,485) and Wells et al. (US Patent 6041709), as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Edwards (US Patent 4,222,325).

For claim 12: The combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Well et al. teaches all of the limitation of claim 12 as recited in parent claim 1. The combination does not teach that the plate cylinder assembly is provided with a stationary shaft on which the plate cylinder is rotatably bearing-mounted, while on opposite sides of the plate cylinder a stop ring is provided which forms the stop surface and is fixedly connected with the stationary shaft while on opposite sides of the plate cylinder a supporting ring is fixedly connected with the stationary shaft. However, Edwards teaches that the plate cylinder **55** (column 8, line 39, Figure 12) is rotatably mounted on a shaft **179** (column 8, line 41, Figure 12), a stop ring **212** (column 9, line 42, Figure 12) which forms a stop surface on annular area **208** (column 9, line 40, Figure 12) and on opposite sides of the plate cylinder, a supporting ring **181** (column 8, line 43, Figure 12) is fixedly connected to the shaft. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Endo, Guaraldi and Well et al. by mounting the plate cylinder rotatably on the stationary shaft while placing a stop ring as taught by Edwards on

opposite sides of the plate cylinder and supporting rings for connecting the plate cylinder fixedly to the shaft for the purpose of being able to rotate and stop the cylinder in the process of printing.

For claim 13: Edwards further teaches that the first subframe (column 8, line 47, Figure 12, labels 160, 161) comprises two receiving units (column 8, lines 47-48, Figure 12, labels 168, 169) which receive the shaft and the supporting rings mounted to it.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 14-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance are found in a previous office action.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30AM-8PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB
November 29, 2008

/Daniel J. Colilla/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854